



# MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

## IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES IN K-12 CAREER EDUCATION

by

Kenneth B. Hoyt  
Director, Office of Career Education

August 1980

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Shirley M. Hufstedler, Secretary

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education  
Thomas K. Minter

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON: 1979**

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402

## Preface

This monograph is one in a series designed to report, in narrative form, discussions that took place during a series of "miniconferences" for local K-12 Career Education Coordinators. A total of 15 such "miniconferences" were held between the period beginning in January and ending in July of 1979. This monograph, like all others in this series, is based on the notes I took while conducting each of these 15 "miniconferences." The OCE contractor responsible for logistical arrangements and for preparation of final notes (as corrected by the participants) was Inter America Research Associates of Rosslyn, Virginia. That Contractor has compiled and published a limited quantity of the final notes. Copies of that report, while they last, may be obtained by writing to the Office of Career Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Participants for this series of miniconferences were selected by OCE based on nominations received from State Coordinators of Career Education. Each such Coordinator was asked to nominate, as possible participants, those K-12 Career Education Coordinators who, in the opinion of the State Coordinator, were doing the best job in implementing career education in their State. It is not, then, in any way a random sample of local K-12 career education coordinators whose experiences and opinions are reported here. Rather, these participants should be viewed as among the best in the opinion of their State Coordinators. Because it was impossible to select all persons nominated, there were many outstanding local Coordinators around the Nation who were not selected as participants.

An attempt was made to secure nominations from all 50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico and to pick a minimum of two local career education coordinators from each State as participants. The original plan was to select 10 participants—one each from 10 different States—as participants in each of the 15 miniconferences. Logistical problems prevented us from reaching this objective of having 150 participants. The final count of participants was 131 persons who, in combination, came from 45 different States and the District of Columbia. The actual number of participants in each miniconference ranged from a low of 7 to a high of 10 with a Statistical average of 8.7 persons in attendance at each of the 15 miniconferences.

Each miniconference was conducted in the same basic way. We started by asking each participant to list the most practical and pressing issues, problems, and concerns she/he is facing in attempting to implement career education. A total of 407 such topics—an average of 27+ per miniconference—were raised by participants. Following this, participants were asked to vote on the 5-6 issues that they considered most crucial of all those raised at their miniconference. As time permitted, then, participants in each miniconference "brainstormed" the priority topics they had selected by their votes. Extensive

discussions were held on 49 such priority topics, several of which are discussed in this monograph. In addition, each participant was asked to present a short oral description of his/her attempts to implement career education in a given community and to share materials with other participants. Those reports and materials also form part of the content of each monograph in this series.

While no exact statistical data were gathered, it appears that participants in this series of miniconferences had, on the average, somewhere between five and six years of experience in attempting to implement career education. The basic purpose of each monograph in this series is to share this rich reservoir of experience with others interested in problems associated with the implementation of career education at the K-12 levels of Education.

The most striking observation one could make about participant comments was, as expected, the wide diversity of means they have found for overcoming the practical problems facing those charged with implementing career education. It should be obvious, to any thoughtful reader, that there is no one best solution for any given problem. Rather, the best way to solve a particular problem will vary from community to community, from State to State, from school districts of various sizes, and from rural, suburban, and urban settings. It is, thus, a diversity of answers that the reader will hopefully find in the monographs in this series.

It will be equally obvious, to the experienced reader, that the practices of these experienced local career education coordinators varies greatly from much of the theoretical/philosophical literature of career education. It is very seldom that practitioners, faced with the multitude of practical constraints that exist at the local community level, can put into practice what those who, like myself, have the time to think, write, and speak about. I am impressed by how close many of them have come. I am even more impressed by some of the innovative, creative solutions some have found that go considerably beyond what the full-time career education conceptualizers have yet been able to think about.

I am most impressed by the dedication, commitment, and professional expertise that participants demonstrated, over and over again, during this series of miniconferences. They are the real experts in career education. I hope that, just as I have learned from them, so, too, will their thoughts and their experiences be helpful to you.

—Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director  
Office of Career Education  
United States Office of Education

# Implementation Issues in K-12 Career Education

Kenneth B. Hoyt  
Director, Office of Career Education  
U.S. Department of Education

## Introduction

The expertise accumulated to date in career education has largely grown out of experiences of K-12 persons as they have attempted to translate the career education concept into effective practices. In the absence of a well developed theoretical/research framework, these practitioners have been forced to rely primarily on their own experimental backgrounds as professional educators. When this background has been inadequate, they have sought advice, consultation, and assistance from a variety of kinds of community resource persons. It is encouraging, not discouraging, to find that the result has been wide diversity in perceptions and practices.

It is especially encouraging to discover the wide variety of implementation issues in career education that have surfaced. Previous monographs in this series have each been devoted to discussion of a single major issue. These monographs have covered a variety of topics including: (a) parents and career education; (b) use of community resources in career education; (c) funding K-12 career education efforts; (d) the community career education coordinator; and (e) staff development practices in career education. The basic purpose of this monograph is to identify and briefly discuss a number of additional implementation issues facing K-12 career education practitioners.

The presentation of each issue discussed in this monograph has been purposefully divided into three major sections. First, a brief description of the issue, as identified by K-12 practitioners, will be presented. Following this, a description of a variety of practices followed in resolving the issue will be given. Finally, the discussion of each issue will conclude with a few personal observations that will hopefully put the issue in a general perspective consistent with the nature of the career education concept in 1980.

# Infusion vs. Separate Course Approaches

## Nature of the Issue

Most career education conceptualizers have strongly urged K-12 professional educators to use an "infusion" rather than a "separate course" approach to delivering the general employability skills of career education to youth. Others have urged the development of a variety of special career education "courses" and/or "units." There is, at present, no hard experimental evidence justifying one approach over the other. The basic issue is one of deciding which approach is most effective and most efficient in delivering the general employability skills of career education to *all* pupils.

A serious question exists with respect to whether or not, if an "infusion" approach is used, a real "add-on" to teacher load has taken place. On the surface, an "add-on" can be arbitrarily defined as anything new that the teacher is being asked to teach which he/she did not teach in the past. If this view is taken, the argument comes down to deciding whether, in fact, the general employability skills of career education are ones good teachers have *always* tried to teach or whether they represent a completely new set of skills. Some practitioners can be found on both sides of this argument.

At a slightly deeper level, the issue of what is an "add-on" is being debated by practitioners in terms of whether career education is best used as a new set of skills or, instead, as a new approach to teaching some of the same skills that have always been considered to be important. That is, if, in the past, the teacher had never sought to consciously provide students with good work habits and now, under the "banner" of career education, makes conscious attempts to do so, it *could* be argued that an "add-on" has taken place. It could also be argued that an underlying emphasis on good work habits has always been part of good teaching and that career education is simply a vehicle for use in making the importance of good work habits more obvious to both teacher and student. In this sense, it could, in no way, be considered to be an "add-on." That is, *if* the activity represents a new *goal* for the teacher, it can be thought of as an "add-on." If, on the other hand, the activity is considered to be an *alternative method* for reaching an already existing goal, it would not be considered to be an "add-on."

There is no argument here with respect to whether or not teachers can be expected to resist any attempts to "add-on" to their already existing teaching responsibilities. They always have expressed such resistance and, in these times of teacher accountability for imparting subject matter, they can be expected to do so even more. Above all else, if teachers are to accept and implement an "infusion" approach to delivering the general employability skills of career education to their students, they must be convinced that one of the results of doing so will be that their students will learn more of the regular subject matter itself. The prime arguments career education advocates

have used in trying to convince teachers of the desirability of an "infusion" approach have been that: (a) the subject matter *itself* can, in a very real sense, be considered as part of the set of general employability skills needed by youth; and (b) a "careers" approach in the classroom can be used as a motivational vehicle leading to increases in academic achievement. That is why, in current attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of career education, a criterion of increases in academic achievement has been often used.

Participants in this series of miniconferences raised serious questions regarding whether or not many of today's teachers—especially those teaching at the secondary school level—*really* see the task of "motivating" students to learn subject matter as one of their regular responsibilities. They reported that many of these teachers—like their counterparts at the college/university levels—regard "motivation" as a responsibility of the student rather than of the teacher. To the extent this is true, then a different set of arguments is required if teachers are to accept and implement an "infusion" approach to career education. Unless such arguments can be made, the "separate course" approach is obviously the most logical alternative to consider.

Among the several different kinds of arguments that participants reported to be effective in convincing teachers of the desirability of an infusion approach, the following were the most common reported: (a) a "career education" approach to teaching, for teachers of elective courses, will encourage more students to elect the course—and so help guarantee the enrollments necessary for the teacher to retain his/her job; (b) a "career education" approach to teaching can lessen the attendance problems faced by classroom teachers; and (c) a "career education" approach to teaching can reduce the incidence of discipline problems for the classroom teacher. Such arguments—in addition to the basic one of the potential of a "career education" approach for increasing academic achievement—were considered by participants to be more appealing to many of today's secondary school teachers than those oriented around the "motivational" potential of a "career education" approach. While some fragmentary evidence now exists justifying such claims for career education, the collection and dissemination of a wide body of hard evidence on these points has not yet occurred.

Finally, those arguing the "infusion" versus the "separate course/unit add-on" approach to delivering career education did so debating the issue of whether a "career education" approach in the classroom made *more work* for the teacher or whether, instead, it made for *more INTERESTING work*. Obviously, those who saw career education only from a "more work" perspective favored the "separate course" approach. Those who saw career education from a "more INTERESTING work" perspective favored the "infusion" approach.

With this background, let us now turn to some specific examples of practices illustrating both approaches.

## Examples of The "Infusion" Approach To Delivering Career Education

The specific issue of "infusion" versus "add-on" approaches to delivering career education was raised, during the series of miniconferences, by a total of 46 of the 131 participants. Of these, 35 reported using an "infusion" approach whereas only 11 reported using an "add-on" approach. If these figures represent a good sampling of "best practices" (and, with the way participants were selected, this seems to be a reasonable assumption), then it is obvious that the "infusion" approach is preferred by a margin of more than 3 to 1 over the "add-on" approach by leading K-12 career education coordinators. Some illustrative examples of how "infusion" is being carried out will be given here.

One clear approach to assuring the "infusion" of career education into classrooms is to have the school board adopt a policy supporting such an approach. Such a policy, to be operationally effective, must include provisions under which school administrators—and particularly building principals—can evaluate the extent to which teachers are implementing such school board policies. The clearest examples of use of this approach were found in school systems on the West Coast. For example, in Oregon City, Oregon, Dale Davis reported there are now 21 specific career education objectives, under five broad career education goals, to be infused throughout the entire K-12 system. By using separate objectives for each grade level, he is able to present each building faculty with a matrix composed of the career education goals/objectives across the top and the specific curriculum areas down the side. Faculty in each building then are able to construct a "custom-made" career education plan for each building *that has strict accountability built-in*.

A second West Coast example can be seen in Tacoma, Washington, where Jim Capelli reports that, as part of school board policy, each teacher must operate using "Student Learning Objectives" (SLO)—including some that relate specifically to career education. There, too, strict teacher accountability is built-in in easily assessable ways. Bernie Griffith, in Cashmere, Washington, has now inserted a "career education" approach in the entire curriculum—including specific career education "tests" to be administered at each grade level and within each subject. In Cashmere, teachers are hired based, in part, on their expressed interest in infusing career education into their classes. They are retained/promoted/fired on the basis of how they convert that interest into effective action. Such actions can be contrasted with, for example, Riverside, California, where Maria Robinson reports that, while career education has been formally adopted as a Board of Education policy, no clearcut system of accountability for that policy has been established—and building principals have been asked only to provide a verbal commitment to career education infusion.

A second basic approach to assuring that "infusion" takes place is seen in several school systems that have adopted a comprehensive K-12 scope

and sequence plan for career education. In some communities—Jefferson County, Kentucky, where Barbara Preli works, is a good example—career education goals/objectives are systematically written into curriculum guides as these guides are being developed for the entire system. Lois Parker, in Montgomery County, Maryland, has a scope and sequence plan for infusing career education written at each grade level and for each subject. Brad Snodgrass, in Palmer, Alaska, has developed his scope and sequence plan through a procedure where teachers are given released time to serve on the Curriculum Council for that school district. Pat Duffy, in Hyannis, Massachusetts, has a very well worked out scope and sequence plan—in spite of the fact that, to date, she has been involved only in a K-6 career education effort.

Third, as an alternative to a formal scope and sequence career education infusion plan, several K-12 school districts have attempted to cover every grade and every subject with “infusion” activities through simply relating such activities to current textbooks being used in that district. Linda Poole, Curriculum Director in Sylvania, Georgia, asked teachers to begin “infusion” efforts through looking carefully at the contents of each textbook and then trying to devise career education activities, where appropriate, for each textbook. LaVerne Kuehn, in Little Rock, Arkansas, did this *for* teachers—as did Carol Gomer in Missoula, Montana. Linda, LaVerne, and Carol all emphasized that: (a) if it’s related to the textbook, they can be very sure teachers *will* use the activity; and (b) if career education activities are built for use with each textbook, the “scope and sequence” problem has been automatically solved.

By far the most common “infusion” strategy currently in use in K-12 school systems appears to be a procedure where teachers pool their thoughts regarding career education *activities* into a single publication or series of publications to be given to all teachers in the school district. For example, Clint Rouse (Daytona Beach, Florida), has had teachers in his school district “invent” 2,000 such strategies which are now grouped by grade level in teacher “infusion notebooks.” Don Stanistreet, from the Syracuse New York School District, began his infusion effort through asking social studies teachers to write 28 career education units. Using these units, he then employed 16 of his best teachers the following Summer to revise these materials and make them available to all elementary teachers in the district.

Pat Duffy, Hyannis Port, Massachusetts, has now developed, with the active aid of teachers in that school district, four large notebooks, each containing examples of career education activities which can be easily infused into various parts of the elementary school curriculum. Phyllis Robinson, from the Wayne County, Michigan Independent School District, has worked with her teachers in compiling a collection of infusion lesson plans which any teacher could use in a single class period. Her project—called ENTICE (Enlisting Teachers To Infuse Career Education)—would be a good model

for many others to examine. Mary Remington, in Pittsburg, Kansas, has now published a special manual for teachers in that school district called "HOW TO INFUSE CAREER EDUCATION." She reports that teachers have found it easy to follow suggestions in that manual. Callie Stanley (Richmond, Virginia) has developed career education "learning activities" in separate packages for various grade levels, K-12, which, when used by Department Heads in each building, allow a custom-made career education "infusion" package for each school building in the entire district.

### Examples of the Course/Unit "Add-on" Approach

Where separate career education "courses" are being used, the single most popular level at which they are taught appears to be in middle/junior high schools. While a few examples were found at the senior high school level, none were reported at the elementary school level. Apparently, "infusion" is working well enough at the elementary school level so as to make a need for separate career education courses unnecessary. In most cases, where a separate career education course has been introduced, it appears that decisions to do so were made primarily because of the fact that "infusion" approaches weren't working well. There were, of course, several other examples presented where career education had started with a "course" approach but had since been switched to an "infusion" approach.

A good example of a junior high career education course was reported by Max Brunton from the Parkrose School District in Portland, Oregon. There, at the 9th grade level, "career exploration" is a required course. With the school year divided into "tri-mesters," the first term is devoted to economic education, the second to acquisition of "career education competencies", and the third devoted to typical 9th grade social studies content. The use of junior high school social studies as a place for insertion of a required career education "course" can also be seen in the "Success Class" being taught in the Weber School District, Ogden, Utah. There, this is a 9 week program placed within the regular social studies course.

Not all career education courses, where taught, are required of all students. For example, in Montgomery County, Maryland, a course entitled "Exploring Vocations" is available as an 8th grade elective. In New Albany, Indiana, 12th grade students can take, as a social studies elective, a yearlong course entitled "Ready-Set-Go!" designed to equip each with job seeking, finding, getting, and holding skills. On the other hand, both Donna Martin (Grand Rapids, Michigan) and Carolyn Corcoran (South Portland, Maine) reported *required* career education courses being taught. Carolyn's course, entitled "Self and Career Exploration", is taught at the 9th grade level. Donna Martin reports a special career education course being taught at the senior high school level which, she hopes, will soon be required for high school graduation.

An interesting variation on the "career education course" concept was reported by Patricia Metalious (North Clarendon, Vermont). There, Patricia, as a high school counselor, operates under a plan where she takes 20 students at a time out of the English classes for a six weeks period for purposes of helping them in career exploration and career decisionmaking. When other participants questioned her about reactions to this practice, Pat informed the group that the English teacher likes it very much because of the opportunities it affords the English teacher to engage in more concentrated individualized instruction with those students Pat doesn't take out of that class. Apparently, the English teacher felt students were learning *more* English under these arrangements than they would have learned had the whole class remained intact during the entire school year.

In Kansas City, Missouri, Sarah Walkenshaw, in an attempt *not* to take time away from subjects being taught in the regular curriculum, initiated a series of Saturday morning seminars on career planning for high school students to take as an elective course. She reports this course is very popular with high school students.

Where taught as separate classes, it seems that the content of most "career education courses" is largely oriented around self and career exploration—often including a large block of experiential learning that takes place through field trips into the community. The second most popular topic around which such courses appear to be oriented is economic education.

### **Personal Observations: The "Infusion" vs. "Separate Course" Issue**

In the long run, those who debate the virtues of the "infusion" versus the "separate course add-on" approach to implementing career education must do so based on the extent to which each approach is effective in attaining the basic goals of career education. It is here where the controversy, at its base, really centers. Those who advocate the "separate course" approach over the "infusion" approach are, by and large, those who view the goals of career education primarily in terms of equipping students with a set of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills that will equip them to change with change.

If this is the sole basis of argument, it seems likely that the argument might best be resolved by recognizing that some of career education's 10 basic general employability skills could perhaps be conveyed to students through the separate course approach as well or better than through an "infusion" approach. If one were to reason in such a fashion, it might lead to conclusions that, if one's goals are equip youth with general employability skills in the areas of:

- (1) Self understanding and understanding of educational and occupational opportunities
- (2) Understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system

- (3) Career decisionmaking
- (4) Job seeking/getting/finding/holding
- (5) Making productive use of leisure time
- (6) Humanizing the workplace for oneself

it might be reasonable to argue that such skills could be imparted at least as well through special courses as through an "infusion" approach. At the same time, it must be recognized that "career education skills" include other additional skills such as:

- (7) Skills in relating subject matter to careers
- (8) Skills in using good work habits
- (9) Skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping
- (10) Skills in developing a personally meaningful set of work values

Very effective arguments could be made that these four kinds of skills can best be provided students through a longitudinal, developmental approach rather than through a single course provided at only one point in time during the student's K-12 educational experience.

If the kind of argument presented here is valid, then it would seem that an appropriate solution might be one of combining infusion approaches with the separate "add-on" course approach—assuming the "add-on" course could be justified as either: (a) producing better results for the six "career education skills" assigned to it than does the "infusion" approach; and/or (b) the "infusion" approach has been rejected by a majority of the teaching faculty.

Career education's basic goals, however, are not, in anyway, limited strictly to providing youth with the 10 general employability skills outlined above. In addition, career education efforts must be viewed in terms of the two basic *process* goals of career education—namely, (1) to serve as a vehicle for linking the broader community more effectively with the formal Education system; and (2) to change the entire Education system in ways that provide a more proper and appropriate emphasis to the goal of preparing youth for work. If these two basic process goals of career education are considered, then it seems reasonable to conclude that the "infusion" approach holds much greater promise than does the separate course "add-on" approach.

That is, if the goal of community involvement with the Education system is considered, it seems obvious that reasons for such linkages extend considerably beyond the confines of career education—that both members of the broader community and of the Education system will see reasons for linkages that are broader than their mutual interest in better readying students for work. To link the broader community with the Education system certainly must be viewed as a task that extends considerably beyond the confines of a single course.

Similarly, if the goal of educational change is considered, it seems obvious that this goal cannot really be met by simply "adding on" either another course—or even another specialist to that which existed before. The "add-on"

approach does NOT make for educational *change* because it leaves the rest of the system to function as it has functioned in the past. Educational change will come only when educators within the entire formal system of Education change in their basic attitudes and actions. The "infusion" approach is, by any logical mode of reasoning, a far better vehicle for use in accomplishing basic educational change than is the separate course "add-on" approach. More than any other single factor, it is recognition of this fact that has led career education advocates, by and large, to advocate the "infusion" approach over the separate course "add-on" approach.

Those career education practitioners now moving toward the separate course "add-on" approach are, by and large, not unaware of the arguments presented here—nor are they in basic disagreement with the contention that, theoretically, an "infusion" approach is to be preferred. Their reasons for moving toward the "add-on" approach have, by and large, been pragmatic in nature—not philosophical. Their basic contention has been that, in their school systems, too many educators are still resisting the "infusion" approach and that, therefore, if they really want to deliver general employability skills to youth, the "add-on" approach must be tried.

There are, at present, some career education conceptualizers in America who also appear to be in favor of the "course add-on", as opposed to the "infusion", approach to implementing career education. Such persons, by and large, are ones who, while strongly in favor of providing youth with the general employability skills of career education, have much less relative interest in the two broad process goals of career education identified here. In particular, some such persons are expressing either disinterest in—or open antagonism to—the goal of educational change. To some such persons, the goal of educational change has been an "albatross around the neck" of career education that they would like to see removed. They really see "career education" as simply an extension of "career guidance".

The position of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career Education is that all three of career education's basic goals—i.e., (1) delivering general employability skills, (2) promoting more and better community/Education system linkages; and (3) changing the Education *system* in ways that bring about a more proper and appropriate emphasis on the goal of education as preparation for work—are equally important and valid. With this basic position, it is obvious that, in general, an "infusion" approach is preferred to as a "course add-on" approach. A "course add-on" approach to implementing career education can be considered legitimate provided: (a) it is intended to *supplement* a basic "infusion" approach rather than replacing or substituting for such an approach; (b) it is offered to students as an elective, rather than as a required course; and (c) such "add-on" courses do not replace existing courses now in the curriculum.

Obviously, all of the hard evidence is not yet available with respect to the effectiveness of the "infusion" versus the "add-on" approach to imple-

menting career education. At present, philosophical beliefs are still the primary basis for positions such as stated here. As more and better research/evaluation evidence is accumulated, the possibility of changing positions must be kept open.

# Should The Term "Career Education" Be Abandoned?

## Nature of the Issue

Career education has, from the beginning, sought to be viewed as a "concept" rather than as a "program." The basic reason behind this is an aspiration that, eventually, the goal of "Education as preparation for work" will assume a proper and appropriate place among the several basic goals of American Education. When that point in time is reached, there will be no need for use of the term "career education." That is, "career education" will have simply become a part of "good Education." This long run aspiration remains strong among career education advocates. The basic issue to be faced is whether or not the career education movement has advanced far enough so that the term "career education" is no longer needed.

Of the 15 two-day "miniconferences" on which this series of monographs has been based, this issue was discussed as a priority item among participants in five of them. Next to the issue of "how to sustain the career education effort," it was the most popular single issue selected by participants for discussion. The thoughts and concerns of these participants deserves to be recorded here.

## Arguments In Favor Of Dropping The Term "Career Education"

*Argument 1: "Career education" HAS become part of "good education."* This argument was made most forcefully by Bernie Griffith from the Cashmere, Washington, public school system. It was also made by Dick Johnson, Superintendent of Schools in Cashmere. Cashmere's career education effort has been a strong and viable one since 1972. Starting only with a 4th grade level, it quickly spread to include all of this K-12 school system. Shortly after beginning this effort, Cashmere made a decision to make "career education" a primary focus of the entire K-12 curriculum. Since that time, one-third of Cashmere's teachers have been released from five to eight days per year to work on the kinds of curriculum revisions necessary to infuse career education into the entire K-12 curriculum. In Cashmere, teachers are hired, in part, based on their knowledge of and interest in career education. Each teacher in that system is held accountable for attaining specific career education objectives (arranged in a scope and sequence format) as well as subject matter objectives each year. Students are tested in "career education" at the same time they are tested on their regular subject matter. That is, tests and examinations given in each subject include items related to career education skills and concepts. Bernie's official job title has been changed from "career education coordinator" to "Director of Curriculum." Career education goals are always included among the basic educational goals voted on by community persons each year as the community helps set educa-

tional priorities for the Cashmere school system—and career education goals always receive high numbers of votes. Both Bernie and Dick report that the term “career education” is now very seldom used in Cashmere—and that there no longer exists any real reason for using that term. Career education *has* become part of “good Education” in Cashmere. (It should be noted here that both Bernie and Dick were quick to point out that “career education” has not yet reached this stage in many school districts and did *not* advocate that the term “career education” be abandoned for such districts.)

*Argument 2: If “infusion” is successful—and it must be—then the term “career education” is superfluous.* This argument was made most forcefully by Gil Woolard, Director of the Kershaw Vocational Center in Camden, South Carolina. Gil reminded the other participants that, years ago, educators tried to attack basic problems in areas such as “health,” “safety,” and “nutrition” by making up new and separate courses to be placed in the curriculum at specific points. Such approaches did not work. Eventually, educators found that the best way to ensure that ALL students have basic knowledge and understanding in these important areas was to make sure that they were emphasized both in textbooks from a wide variety of disciplines and in the teaching/learning process. When this was done, the need for “programs” in the separate areas disappeared. Gil is convinced that this is the direction in which the career education movement should be headed.

*Argument 3: The term “career education” is too fuzzy. Our efforts will be better understood and accepted if put in terms of the specific employability skills we seek to impart to youth.* Gary Gramm of the Huron, South Dakota, school system was one of several who raised this argument. Gary's point was that, if he tells people youth need to learn how to do “job interviews,” he finds wide support and backing. However, when he says he wants to do “career education,” many ask him “what's that?” Others pointed out that they are tired of trying to define, for others, the differences between “career education” and “vocational education”—that most of those persons seem to understand that both “prepare youth for work” and express little interest in further distinctions we want to make between the meaning of these two terms.

*Argument 4: The basic changes career education seeks to make in the Education system apply to many things in addition to “career education” so the term “career education” isn't really needed.* Those raising this argument tended to talk about the generic utility of such things as: (a) field trips for students; (b) use of community resource persons in classrooms; (c) an activity-oriented approach to the teaching/learning process; (d) motivating students to learn; and (e) reduction of stereotyping as examples of changes generally needed in the total system of American Education. They felt that, if persons could be rallied around the need to make these basic kinds of specific changes in the Education system, there would be no need to do all of this in the name of “career education.” As a matter of fact,

some voicing this argument felt that use of the term "career education" was preventing some persons from paying attention to these needed kinds of generic changes.

*Argument 5: The term "career education" has outlived its usefulness—a new "banner" for educational change is now needed.* Several participants supported this point claiming that no identified call for educational change has a very long life under a single term. Educational "fads" come and go, but each seems to have some common threads regarding needed educational change that continue long after a specific term loses its popularity. Others pointed out that any new term—including "career education"—tends to get defined in so many ways in both philosophy and practice that it carries operational meaning for only a limited number of years. Still others pointed to automobile manufacturers as an example of the need for change from the term "career education" to something else—i.e., there has, for many years, always been a "small, cheap Ford", but many "brand names" have been used to identify it. They felt the same principle could apply to "career education."

*Argument 6: Many terms could be used for what we are doing that would be both broader and more understandable to the general public than is the term "career education."* Those raising this argument were quick to suggest alternative terms they felt were better to use than the term "career education." Among the suggestions received were ones that we call what we are doing by one of the following terms: (a) "Life centered curriculum"; (b) "Human development education"; (c) "Meaningful education"; (d) "Life education"; (e) "Community involvement education"; (f) "Free enterprise education"; and (g) "Career development education." Each person suggesting such a new term had a set of reasons why he/she felt that term was preferable to the term "career education."

Arguments such as those presented in this section are not ones to be taken lightly. Those advancing such arguments were all career education practitioners in public school settings, many of whom had been on the job for several years. Had they not been serious about such arguments, they would not have raised this issue.

## **Arguments In Favor Of Retaining The Term "Career Education"**

In general, more of the participants in this series of miniconferences supported retaining the term "career education" than supported proposals made to drop the term. The major arguments used by these persons are presented below. It is important to remember that these persons are fully as experienced as career education practitioners—and so just as "expert"—as those who presented arguments against the term.

*Argument 1: We are, in most school systems, still far from the point where "career education" and "good education" are synonymous terms.* While, to be sure, there are now a few K-12 school systems where the career educa-

tion concept has been completely infused throughout, most school systems are still far from reaching that point in development. A good many school systems are still not even familiar with the term. Even in school systems where the term has been used for a number of years, there are many teachers who still don't understand what it means.

*Argument 2: The term "career education" is needed as a rallying point to encourage legislative support at the State and Federal levels.* Those using this argument voiced fears that, as of today, there is still far too much of educational legislation that is categorical in nature. If the time ever comes when Federal and State support for Education is provided in block grants—with local school districts free to spend the money in any way they choose—such persons expressed great confidence that they would be able to secure sufficient financial resources, at the local level, to continue their career education efforts. However, with so much categorical Federal and State aid on the books—and so many current difficulties in financing local school districts—these persons felt a great need for continuation of *some* categorical funding for "career education." If the term disappears, so, too, would the categorical funding.

*Argument 3: We have to call what we are doing something—and "career education" is at least as good a term as anything else.* Those expressing support for this argument pointed out that, if an effort exists, people are going to insist that it be named *something*. If *some* name has to be used, they felt the term "career education" considerably better than some of the alternative names proposed by other conference participants. They were particularly concerned that, unless the term "career education" continues to be used, people will continue to have difficulty understanding that, while we are talking about the generic goal of preparing persons to work, we are talking about considerably more than what has been done in the past under the term "vocational education."

*Argument 4: "Career education" is a term that is very appealing to community persons—more so than any other educational term to come along in many years.* Several participants emphasized that, when they explain "career education" to community persons in terms of its three broad goals (e.g., employability skills, community linkages, and educational change) they find wide community support from very diverse segments of the educational community. The *diversity* of community segments expressing support for "career education" appears to be greater than the *diversity* expressing support for any other single attempt at educational change.

*Argument 5: If some more generic term is substituted for the term "career education," the central importance of WORK may be undermined.* Those voicing this argument were particularly concerned about attempts on the part of some others to substitute the four letter word "Life" for the four letter word "work" as the base term in the concept. While quick to admit that Education is properly viewed as "preparation for Life" and that "prepara-

tion for making a living" is only part of "preparation for living," these participants did not view these things as sufficient to justify use of the word "Life" rather than the word "work" as the bedrock term in the career education concept. Their insistence on use of the word "work" stemmed largely from a feeling that, if "Life Education"—rather than "Career Education"—is adopted the emphasis career education seeks to give to the central importance of "work" in one's total lifestyle will, once again, be relegated to a position of minor importance. They felt strongly that this would be a tragic mistake.

## Personal Observations

As I listened to and tried to learn from participants on both sides of this issue, it seemed to me that their arguments disguised, to a great extent, the considerable amount of agreement among them that the career education *movement*—by whatever name—is one that should be continued for an indefinite period. This movement, unlike most other calls for educational change that have come along in the past, has been fairly successful—although not universally so—in retaining an emphasis on *concept* rather than on *program*. By so doing, it has managed to serve as a vehicle for use in helping to meet a good many "mandates of the moment" that have come to American Education over the past decade. Whether the cry is for "back to basics," for "better discipline in the school," for "greater community involvement in Education", or for "increasing cost effectiveness of Education", career education has proven itself to be a useful vehicle for meeting that mandate.

A word of caution is necessary here. It was best expressed in one mini-conference by Thera Johnson, Weber School District, in Ogden, Utah. Thera's point was that, while career education can be used as a vehicle in any "mandate" that calls for (a) infusion into classrooms and (b) greater community involvement with the Education system, it cannot be expected to serve as a vehicle for use in meeting ALL mandates that come to the Education system. For example, if the "mandate of the moment" is for "bilingual education," the career education concept, no matter how well applied, can be expected to make relatively little contributions to meeting that mandate. In spite of such obvious limitations, the potential of career education as a vehicle for use in meeting a variety of kinds of educational "mandates of the moment" is, in my opinion, a prime reason for continuing this movement.

The ultimate goal of reaching that point where "career education" becomes simply a recognized and appropriate part of "good education" is still an excellent one toward which to head. So far as I can tell, we are a very long way from meeting that goal in most K-12 public school systems today.

There aren't *many* "Cashmere, Washingtons" in the United States so far as I can tell. I look forward to the day when the term "career education" will no longer be needed. In my opinion, that day is still many years in the future.

# The "Career Education"/"Vocational Education" Controversy

## Nature of the Issue

The basic problem, as voiced by participants in this series of miniconferences, is one of how to maintain and/or build effective working relationships between career education and vocational education without losing either (a) the support of persons from other parts of the Education system; or (b) the basic differences in meaning between the two terms—"career education" and "vocational education." Related problems expressed by participants included those associated with avoiding "turf" fights between vocational education and career education—particularly at the State and Federal levels and how to convince vocational educators that, while "career education" and "vocational education" mean different things, vocational educators—like all other educators—have responsibilities for participating in the implementation of career education.

Participants were *not* worried about defining differences in meaning between the terms "vocational education" and "career education." Apparently, they were comfortable on this question even though they recognized much remains to be done before many other educators—and members of the general public—fully understand such differences. Neither were participants worried about whether or not they should be supporters of vocational education. *No participants were encountered who expressed disinterest in, antagonism to, or lack of support for vocational education.* Their worries were more often expressed in terms of a perceived reduction in support, on the part of some vocational educators, for career education—not vice versa.

Many of these participants were persons who have been engaged in career education since 1970—or even earlier—when this movement was formally introduced into American Education. These participants recalled the overwhelming support vocational educators voiced for career education in the "early days" and expressed strong desires for a return to that previous level of support. They were particularly concerned about this problem as they perceived it to operate at the State/Federal levels, as opposed to the local community levels. As will be seen in several of the examples to be presented in the next section, there are many communities where relationships between vocational education and career education are excellent at the local community level. Participants worried and wondered about why this same situation apparently does not exist at other levels of Education.

A host of more specific problems were illustrated by participants as they described their local career education practices. These will hopefully become clear as local practices are discussed.

## Local Practices: Career Education/Vocational Education Relationships

In viewing local community practices, the first significant observation to

make is that, in many communities, vocational educators are today serving as the school system's "career education coordinator." In smaller school districts, examples can be found in (a) Jimmy Dolan (Boone County, West Virginia), (b) Joe Tomaselli (Tom's River, New Jersey), (c) Cliff Clausson (Detroit Lakes, Minnesota), and (d) Gil Woolard (Camden, South Carolina). In each of these communities, the career educational effort operates under the professional leadership of a recognized vocational education professional.

In many other communities, the person assigned primary responsibility for career education, while sometimes not regarded as a vocational educator *per se*, is employed by and operates out of a vocational educational facility. Examples of this situation can be seen when one looks at: (a) Herman Grizzle (Tulsa County Area Vo-Tech School), (b) Gene Willich (Southwest Kansas Area Vo-Tech School), (c) Gertrude Alioth (Vocational Department, Inglewood, California), (d) Charles Farnsworth (Four County Area Vocational Cooperative—Garret, Indiana), and (e) Mary Kosier (Central Kansas Area Vo-Tech School). Were it not for the financial and professional support of vocational education, none of these persons—along with several others of these participants—would be employed.

The practice of asking one key professional person to head up both career education and vocational education extends to larger school systems as well. Both Jim Capelli (Clover Park School) District—Tacoma, Washington) and Al Glassman (Philadelphia Public Schools) are good examples. Al Glassman is a particularly good example in that he serves as that large school district's coordinator of career education, of vocational education, and of all CETA manpower programs—in short, of *all* programs in the Philadelphia School District related to the generic goal of "education as preparation for work." As a result of Al Glassman's professional leadership, the Philadelphia Public Schools serve as an outstanding example of a large school district where career education and vocational education operate in harmony with few daily operational problems.

Within a particular State, perhaps the most outstanding examples of close and harmonious relationships between career education and vocational education can be found in the State of Ohio. Miniconference participants from Ohio—including Lou Cicek (Willoughby-Eastlake City Schools), John Meighan (Tri-County J.V.S.—Nelsonville), Jama Roman (Toledo), Nancy Losekamp (Upper Arlington), and Mike Zockle (Warren) all expressed great appreciation for the outstanding support and leadership given to career education by Dr. Byrl Shoemaker, State Director of Vocational Education, in the Ohio State Department of Education. While several additional States could be named where strong support from State Directors of Vocational Education can be found, there seems little doubt but that Ohio is an outstanding example for those who wish to study positive relationships between vocational education and career education.

In practice, there seems to be a general feeling that the presence of a strong and viable career education effort is a very effective way of increasing both the quality and the quantity of students who enroll in secondary school vocational education programs. This, quite obviously, has been much of the rationale behind the strong support given to career education by vocational educators in Ohio. Specific reports from school districts with data demonstrating the validity of this feeling were reported both by Jim Williams, New Albany, Indiana and by Joe Tomaselli from Tom's River, New Jersey. Both emphasized that, while the *purpose* and *goals* of career education center around expanding freedom to choose wisely from among *all* available opportunities, one observational *result* has been that both more and better students choose to enroll in vocational education. Both stressed a strong belief that their career education efforts, at the elementary school level, had made significant contributions to these results.

On the other hand, several other participants reported that, to the extent vocational education funds were being made available to them in support of their efforts, such funds were being restricted for use only in secondary school settings and could not be used for elementary school career education activities. Jimmy Dofan (Boone County, West Virginia), for example, indicated that he is not permitted to use vocational education funds below the secondary school level. Sandy Bode (DuPage County, Illinois) reported that, while federally appropriated vocational education funds cannot be used to support elementary school career education activities, State funds appropriated for vocational education can be used in this way. Pearl Solomon (Pearl River, New York) reported that she has requested vocational education funds be used for her elementary school career education component on the grounds that, if students are to be free to choose vocational education, that effort must begin at the elementary school level.

Some school districts reported even more stringent requirements being placed on use of vocational education funds for career education. For example, Kathy Backus (New Haven, Connecticut) indicated that, while vocational education funds were made available for establishing and operating a Career Resource Center, only students enrolled in vocational education were to be allowed to use that Center. This appears to be an extreme example not generally found where Career Resource Centers are operating. For example, both Shirley Aberg (Elk River, Illinois) and Homer Sweeney (Fremont, California) reported great support from vocational educators for establishing such Centers and for making them available to *all* students—academic as well as vocational—in the school district.

In Riverton, Wyoming, Keith Curry reported an interesting "twist" on what is usually seen. There, a major career education effort was begun in the early 1970s with a large Federal grant. One of the results of that effort was a successful school bond issue in Riverton for purposes of building and operating a comprehensive vocational education center. Keith indicated that,

had it not been for the career education effort, it is doubtful if the community would have demonstrated such strong support for vocational education.

Several of these participants were vocational education teachers in their school districts now. In most instances, they had been employed in earlier years (when Federal vocational education funds were more readily available for use in career education) as career education coordinators. Now, as teachers, they are still actively involved in implementing career education within their own school districts. Prime examples here include Jim Sullivan (who now serves as a Distributive Education teacher from Providence, Rhode Island), Betty Flaherty (who now serves as a business education teacher in Brookline, Massachusetts) and Carol Chapin (who now operates career education primarily through the HERO youth program in Reno, Nevada). All three of these persons indicated that, while they are still finding success in encouraging teachers to become actively involved in career education, their successes are much greater in the specific secondary schools where they are employed than in elementary schools found within their school districts.

Some career education specialists employed in vocational education facilities within their school district feel they have gained by being housed there. A good example is Carol Weigner from Elkhart, Indiana. Her career education efforts are housed in the Elkhart Career Center—a vocational-technical high school. She reports this to be an advantage in that (a) she can show elementary teachers who come to her Center some of the specific ways people are preparing themselves for work, and (b) she has been able to do “cross-age learning experiences” where high school students in vocational education explain to elementary school students what they are learning, the careers they are preparing for, and the importance of learning the basic academic skills while still in elementary schools. According to Carol, relationships between vocational education teachers and academic teachers have become more positive since she began the career education effort. While she admitted that some academic teachers are suspicious that she may, in fact, be “recruiting” youth for vocational education, she feels strongly that the advantages of being housed in a vocational-educational school far outweigh the disadvantages.

In most of the school districts represented in this series of miniconferences, “career education” and “vocational education” operated as fairly separate entities. When participants in one miniconference addressed the specific question of what would happen in their school districts if “career education” were to become only a part of “vocational education,” five out of six who responded predicted dire results would occur. Pearl Solomon, for example, indicated the essential importance of retaining an emphasis on the “adaptability skills” of career education as opposed to the “specific vocational skills” of vocational education—and the importance of maintaining the “work values” emphasis of career education as opposed to the “work ethic” empha-

sis of vocational education. Sandy Bode felt strongly that both educators and the general public have enough trouble understanding the differences between "career education" and "vocational education" even when they operate separately—and that it would be impossible to differentiate the two if they were joined together. Barbara Churchill (Attleboro, Massachusetts) felt that, if the two were put together, vocational education would "swallow up" career education. Several felt that, if the two were placed together, they would lose the support of academic teachers that they now enjoy. These fears and apprehensions were also expressed by many other miniconference participants—in spite of the fact that, as has been shown by earlier examples presented here, these kinds of fears are not always justified in practice.

When the general topic of "career education/vocational education relationships" was raised by participants, it was not at all unusual to find several participants respond by saying that their prime "turf" problems, at the present time, are with counselors, not with vocational educators. While that topic is not one appropriate to consider here, it should be mentioned in order for this topic to be put in proper perspective.

There were two pervasive problems outlined by participants with respect to the relationships between career education and vocational education. One such problem is that, since career education was begun largely through the initiative of vocational educators, there are still many vocational educators who consider career education to be "theirs"—and, thus, who resent persons other than vocational educators becoming involved in the effort. The second major problem raised was that vocational educators are increasingly being held accountable for making sure their funds are spent *only* for vocational education and that, as a result, they have been unable to continue their previously high levels of support for career education.

## Personal Observations

As I have tried to reflect and think about the many things these participants taught me about career education/vocational education relationships, several thoughts became more clear in my own thinking.

First, I am very favorably impressed by what appears to be an almost universal expression for support of vocational education on the part of these career education practitioners. Their zeal for promoting the career education concept has, in no way, diminished the high regard they hold for vocational education. If anything, it seems to have made them even more convinced that vocational education is a needed and important part of the American system of public education. It seems safe to say that vocational educators have nothing to fear in the form of criticism from leading K-12 career education practitioners.

Second, I am unworried about those reported observations indicating that, in several school systems, a career education effort has resulted in more and

better students enrolling in vocational education. If this kind of finding were to be *universally* true, I would be very worried indeed. It obviously is not. That is, the prime goal of career education, with respect to educational decisionmaking, is to supply youth with sufficient information and experiences so that they can make more *reasoned* choices—NOT to lead them toward a particular type of choice. If a bonafide career education effort exists and, as a result, more students enroll in vocational education, it will be because vocational education *deserved* more students. The opposite situation could just as well occur. That is, if, through a career education effort, students discovered new and what, to them, appeared to be better educational opportunities in other parts of the school system, then vocational education would receive *fewer* students. Career education seeks to create conditions for student choice that will result in each part of the education system getting the students it *deserves*—no more and no less. It is only to the extent that prior bias and prejudice has prevented students from considering vocational education as a legitimate choice that a career education effort should hold potential for increasing vocational education enrollments. So long as this is kept clearly in mind, there is no valid basis for any other part of the total education system to object.

Third, I sensed, in the reports given by several of these participants, a reluctance on the part of some vocational educators to become active participants in the total career education effort. It is almost as though, once having recognized career education and vocational education as two *different* aspects of the total school system effort to better prepare youth for work, some vocational educators seem to feel they do not belong in career education. Obviously, nothing could be further from the truth. When we say the career education implementation effort will require participation on the part of ALL educators, we certainly mean that it includes vocational educators as well as other professional persons in the total education system. Vocational education students, as well as all other students, need the general employability skills of career education as well as whatever other skills are regarded as the primary mission of the teacher. The vocational education teachers who were participants in this series of miniconferences stand as exemplary models for other vocational education teachers to follow. It is hoped this will happen.

Fourth, it is increasingly clear to me that, at the local community level, much better operational models exist for positive relationships between vocational education and career education than are typically seen at the State/Federal levels. The model illustrated by Al Glassman in the Philadelphia School District is far superior to that existing in most State Departments of Education—and certainly far superior to models seen at the National/Federal levels at the present time. It seems inevitable that, as any effort moves beyond the local community level (where the *real* consumers—i.e., the *students*—are, “turf” problems become more common and more complex.

It is much better, if a choice were to be forced, to see that conditions are more ideal at the local than at either the State or National levels. It would be fare better, of course, if State/National leaders could listen to and learn more from professional leaders at the school district level.

Finally, discussions held during this series of miniconferences have convinced me that we are correct in trying to make clear the basic differences between "career education" and "vocational education." It has not made—and will not make—much difference to the general public, but it is extremely important for decisions to be made by professional educators themselves. Moreover, with the great current strength and long history of vocational education—when contrasted with the obvious weakness and short history of career education—it is also obvious that attempts be made to continue to make distinctions between these two major efforts to better prepare youth for work.



# Career Education Resource Centers

## Nature of the Issue

Career education advocates, in urging school districts to initiate career education efforts, have often pictured career education as a concept that requires no *new* curriculums, courses, teachers, or buildings in order to function effectively. Instead, we have urged school districts to use the resources already available to them—both within the school system and in the broader community.

As K-12 school systems have set about to implement career education, a concept not yet commonly discussed in the career education literature has become a reality in many school districts—the concept of the CAREER EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER. At several of the miniconferences, participants described the nature and operation of such centers in some detail. If we are to look at implementation problems facing K-12 career education practitioners, it is now obvious that a discussion of the Career Education Resource Center must be included.

## Examples of Successful Practices

*Essie Page—Washington, D.C. Public Schools.* The majority of career education services flow through 20 different career education resource centers located within the total structure of the Washington, D.C. public school system. There is one such Center in each senior high school as well as one in each of the six regional offices in this school system. The six regional centers serve primarily elementary and junior high school students in the system while, at the senior high school level, the Center in each school serves primarily only the students in each school. Each Career Education Resource Center is staffed with a professional person—usually a professional school counselor. Opportunities exist in each Center for students to conduct research on various kinds of careers they are considering. A very wide variety of kinds of career and educational information is housed in each Center. In addition, computer terminals have been installed in several of the centers for use in helping students gain guidance information on an interactive basis with the computer.

*Asahi Oshima—Boulder, Colorado.* Two kinds of “career resource centers” exist for use by students in the Boulder school system. One kind, established by professional counselors using funds available under provisions of Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has been installed in individual schools as part of the guidance suite. Asahi reported that some problems *do* exist in terms of coordinating activities within these Centers with the regular career education instructional effort, but that those problems are now in the process of becoming resolved. The second kind of

Center is formally called the "Career Education Resource Center" and is physically housed in local Chamber of Commerce offices in Boulder. Jointly funded by the Chamber of Commerce and the Boulder Board of Education, the actual operations of this Center are carried on by Chamber employees. This Center is used to provide resources for field trips, resource speakers for classrooms, to secure donated (or loaned) equipment from business and industry settings, for organizing and arranging for "shadowing," and other related experiences involving community "partnerships" with the school system. In operation, it is seen primarily as a Chamber of Commerce—not as a school system—activity.

*Kathy Backus—New Haven, Connecticut.* Operating out of the Area Cooperative Education Services in New Haven, Kathy works in a regional career education center that serves, during a typical school year, as many as 300 K-12 school systems. Her Career Education Resource Center houses more than 8,000 career education items—half of which are media. They have an active effort to supply teachers with materials and ideas for use in developing their own career education activity packages for use in classroom infusion of career education. The career education materials in this Center have now been computerized and classified by grade level and by career education concept so that it is very easy for any given teacher to find materials that are likely to be helpful. One of the popular publications they have developed is entitled "Guidelines For Use Of Career Education Resource Centers" and Kathy reports that publication, as well as the Center itself, has now become extremely popular with teachers in her area of Connecticut.

*Jim Crook—Yakima, Washington.* Seven school districts in the Greater Yakima Valley have joined together to form the "Yakima Valley Vocational Educational Cooperative." As part of that Cooperative, Jim has been employed to establish and operate what is now known as the "Career Awareness Center." (He's trying to change its name to the "Career Center.") This Center is now funded by the Yakima School District and serves students in that school district free and others in the region on a contractual basis. Jim's "Career Awareness Center" has, as part of its operations, a file of 300-400 community resources. In addition, they operate an "Occupational Awareness Mobile Learning Center" (which is actually a mobile van) that visits elementary schools on an annual schedule that calls for spending up to 6 weeks at each elementary school. Within the Career Awareness Center, both students and teachers can receive information and consultative services. This includes classroom orientations to show students future educational opportunities they might consider (including, but not limited to, those in vocational education). Three full-time professional staff, one aid (who drives the van) and one secretary are required in this operation.

*Joe Tomaselli—Tom's River, New Jersey.* In Tom's River, the Career Education Resource Center is located within the facilities of the area vo-tech school where Joe serves as Principal. There, the Center functions in several

ways including: (a) an organizing point for visits elementary school students make to the vo-tech school; (b) as a source of career education materials for teachers from feeder schools; and (c) as a computerized occupational information system for use by junior high school students in career exploration. The Center is located in attractive surroundings near the entrance to the vo-tech school. I have visited it personally and was favorably impressed.

*Don Stanistreet—Syracuse, New York.* In Syracuse, each 6th grader spends two days at the Career Skills Center where he/she can engage in individualized career awareness/career exploration using 17 booths, each representing a major local industry. Within each booth are sets of tapes and headsets students can use in this experience. In addition, there are a set of "learning stations" for use by teachers who want to have what are, in effect, "mini-courses" on such diverse topics as "How to Use The Dictionary of Occupational Titles," or "How To Use The Occupational Outlook Handbook." In addition to helping teachers become more expert in career education, these "learning stations" are used by many teachers as part of their own career development.

*Shirley Iaquinio—Phoenix, Arizona.* In the Phoenix school system, there is a "Career Education Media Center" in each school building along with a central Center at the school district level. All career education media materials in these centers are classified by subject matter area, by the 8 career education elements in the Arizona matrix, and by the 15 occupational clusters made popular by the Vocational Education Division of the former United States Office of Education. These Centers are used primarily as resource rooms for teachers who are searching for innovative ways to infuse career education into their classrooms.

*Betty Barr—Omaha, Nebraska.* Omaha's public schools have established the "Learning Resource Center For Career Education." This Center provides career awareness—including several kinds of "hands on" experiences—to 1800 5th graders annually. In addition, teachers make extensive use of the Center for purposes of gathering materials and ideas for their classroom infusion activities in career education. Desegregation funds available to the Omaha public schools have been used to help defray the expenses of this Center.

*Jim Sullivan—Providence, Rhode Island.* The Career Resource Center in Providence, located in the building where Jim teaches, serves students, Grades 9-12 as well as teachers in that building. It is open to any student during study periods, before school, and after school. All 9th Grade English classes come to this Center at least once a year to undertake "career" projects.

*Carol Chapin—Reno, Nevada.* Of the five high schools in the Reno public school system, 2 have established "Career Centers." These Centers are operated by non-career paraprofessional persons whose only required qualification is that they have an interest in career education. Within each

Center, one can find a wide variety of commercially purchased career education materials—including films, filmstrips, and college catalogues. A concentrated effort is made to purchase materials from a variety of companies so that no standard format can be developed.

*Steve Jones—Concord, New Hampshire.* Steve considers his "Career Education Resource Center" to be the "heart" of Concord's total career education effort. Staffed by a well trained paraprofessional person, materials flow from this Center to teachers upon request. All materials in this Center are being coded according to the Library of Congress system, the information being put on cards, and duplicate cards being sent to each local school so that teachers can order materials from the Center without physically having to travel to it. The costs of this Center are being paid for out of local school district funds.

*Janie Hire—Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.* The single most extensive "Career Education Resource Center" described by participants was the one Janie operates. This center—originally funded in 1974 with a Title IV-C ESEA grant—is physically located in the school library (which has been expanded so as to be able to accommodate it). Several services are made routinely available through this Center including: (a) routing of career education materials to teachers when that material is obviously related to the subject matter being taught; (b) serving as sites for routine visits of all 10th and 11th graders who systematically visit the Center each year; (c) supplying teachers, upon request, with "career" materials guaranteed to be directly related to their subject matter; and (d) serving as a resource site for any teacher who wishes to bring his/her class to the Center for purposes of relating careers to the subjects they are now studying.

## **Personal Observations**

The examples presented above represent only 12 out of more than 20 given by participants during this series of miniconferences. They have been purposely selected so as to provide a picture of both the nature and the diversity of career education resource centers. Several general observations appear to be in order with reference to this part of the total career education effort.

First, it is obvious that, by and large, these centers have been designed—and actually operate—in ways that allow them to serve both students and teachers. Students can find, in these centers, a variety of kinds of career materials and opportunities for career awareness/exploration/decisionmaking. Teachers typically use these Centers to acquire materials and ideas for infusing career education into classroom settings. It is obvious that, in a very real sense, many of these Centers serve as a hub of teacher inservice in career education.

The variety of ways in which costs of establishing and operating these Centers is noteworthy. Apparently, a variety of Federal funds have been used—including some from vocational education, from the Emergency School Aid Act, from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and still others. On occasion, local school districts have paid the costs directly while, on other occasions, costs have been borne by various segments of the broader community. It is obvious, from the description of the kinds of materials found in these centers—and the ways in which they are staffed—that there *is* a sizeable cost involved in their operation.

It should be equally obvious that these Centers have brought a sense of organization and efficiency to these school districts operating them that is missing from many other career education efforts. Even those operated with paraprofessional personnel seem to be supplying a great deal of needed information in an organized, systematic manner.

As the career education movement matures still further, it seems reasonable to expect that the presence of Career Education Resource Centers will increase still further. Where the funds required to organize and implement such Centers will come from is not so obvious.



## Concluding Thoughts

The four specific career education implementation issues summarized in this monograph are, of course, only some of those facing career educational practitioners. Some others are presented as separate subjects in other monographs in this series. Still others—including, for example, such issues as (a) career education for special education students; (b) career education and economic education; and (c) career education's contributions to reducing bias and stereotyping could well have been included as additional sections of this monograph. They are not here simply because not enough career education practitioners who participated in these miniconferences information was supplied by participants on these topics to justify a special section—not because they are unimportant.

If there is a single, general set of messages to be communicated by the contents of this monograph, such messages would include: (a) K-12 career education practitioners are fully capable of defining and discussing crucial conceptual issues—they should be listened to more by those who make conceptual/policy decisions regarding career education; and (b) if an issue can be identified, there are several K-12 career education practitioners somewhere in our Nation who have already devised some unique and innovative approaches to solving it. It is hoped that, by sharing some of their thoughts in this monograph, some readers may be able to gain some of the benefits of having attended one or more of the miniconferences on which this monograph was based. It is a tremendous learning experience. The K-12 career education practitioners who participated in these miniconferences deserve deep thanks and appreciation from all of us.



## Participants

Shirley Aberg  
Assistant Director of Career  
Guidance Center  
Region 7—Triton College  
2000 5th Avenue  
River Grove, Illinois 60171

Gertrude Alioth  
Supervisor, Career Education  
Vocational and Bilingual Department  
Inglewood Unified School District  
401 S. Inglewood Avenue  
Inglewood, California 90301

Kathy Backus, Director  
Career Education Resource Center  
Area Cooperative Education Services  
800 Dixwell Avenue  
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Betty Barr  
Career Education Director  
11629 Jackson Road  
Omaha, Nebraska 68154

Sandra Bode, Director  
DuPage Elementary Career  
Education Center  
421 N. County Farm Road  
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Max Brunton  
Administrative Assistant  
Secondary Instruction  
Parkrose School District #3  
10636 N.E. Prescott  
Portland, Oregon 97220

James G. Capelli, Supervisor  
Vocational and Career Education,  
K-12  
Clover Park School District  
10020 Gravely Lake Drive, S.E.  
Tacoma, Washington 98499

Carol Chapin  
HERO Youth Program  
425 East Ninth Street  
Reno, Nevada 89512

Barbara Churchill  
Director, Project Potential  
Attleboro High School  
Rathburn Willard Drive  
Attleboro, Massachusetts 02703

Louis Cicek  
Coordinator  
Career Development Program  
Willoughby-Eastlake City Schools  
Cricket Lane School  
2822 Cricket Lane  
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44092

Cliff Claussan  
Vocational Education Administration  
425 Broadway  
Detroit Lakes Cooperative Center  
#22  
Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56501

Carolyn Corcoran  
South Portland City Schools  
130 Wescott Road  
South Portland, Maine 04106

James Crook, Director  
Career Center—A.C. Davis High  
School  
212 South Sixth Avenue  
Yakima, Washington 98902

Keith Curry  
Guidance Counselor  
Freemont School District  
322 Elizabeth Drive  
Riverton, Wyoming 85201

Dale Davis  
Director of Career Education  
P.O. Box 591  
1417 12th Street  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Jimmy Dolan  
Vocational Director  
Boone County Board of Education  
69 Avenue B  
Madison, West Virginia 25130

Patricia Duffy  
Barnstable High School  
Hyannis, Massachusetts

Charles Farnsworth  
Four County Area Vocational  
Cooperative  
Garrett High School  
Garrett, Indiana 46738

Elizabeth Flaherty  
Business Education Department  
Brookline High School  
115 Greenough Street  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Albert I. Glassman  
Executive Director for Career  
Education  
J.F. Kennedy Center  
734 Schuylkill Avenue  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146

Carol Gomer  
Career Education Coordinator  
School District #1  
215 South 6th, W.  
Missoula, Montana 58901

Gary Gramm  
Assistant Director of Career  
Education  
South Dakota Division of  
Vocational—Technical Education  
P.O. Box 1237  
Huron, South Dakota 57350

Bernadette Griffith  
Cashmere School District  
Career Education Division  
210 South Division  
Cashmere, Washington 98815

Herman Grizzle  
Career Education Coordinator  
Tulsa County Area Voc-Tech School  
3420 S. Memorial Drive  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Janice Hire  
Career Education Specialist  
Putnam City High School  
5300 N.W. 50th  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73122

Shirley Iaquinto, Coordinator  
Roosevelt Comprehensive Career  
Education  
600 South Seventh Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Richard Johnson  
Superintendent of Schools  
Cashmere School District  
Cashmere, Washington 98815

Thera Johnson  
Career Education Coordinator  
Weber School District  
1122 Washington Blvd.  
Ogden, Utah 84404

Steve Jones  
Office of Superintendent of Schools  
16 Rumford Street  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Mary Kosier  
Central Kansas Area  
Vocational-Technical School  
Newton, Kansas 67114

LaVerne Kuehn  
Career Education Specialist  
Pulaski Co. Special School District  
P.O. Box 6409  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72216

Nancy Losekamp  
Career Education Coordinator  
Upper Arlington Board of Education  
Upper Arlington City Schools  
1950 North Mallway  
Upper Arlington, Ohio 43221

Donna Martin  
Career Education Specialist  
Illinois Office of Education  
100 North First Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62777

John Meighan, Coordinator  
Career Development Program  
Tri-County J.V.S.  
Route 1 State Rt. 691  
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Patricia Metalious  
Mill River Union High  
N. Clarendon, Vermont 05759

Asahi Oshima  
Boulder Public Schools  
Boulder, Colorado 80301

Essie Page  
State Coordinator of Career  
Education

Ellington School of the Arts  
Room 102  
35th and R Streets, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Lois Parker  
Coordinator of Career Education  
Montgomery County Board of  
Education  
850 Hungerford Drive  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Linda Poole  
Screven County Schools  
Sylvania, Georgia 30467

Barbare Preli  
Director/Career Education  
Jefferson County Schools  
Brown Education Center—  
Room 508  
4th and Broadway  
Louisville, Kentucky 40059

Mary Remington  
USD #250  
510 Deill Street  
Pittsburgh, Kansas 66762

Maria Robinson  
Career Education and Work  
Experience  
San Jose Unified School District  
1605 Park Avenue  
San Jose, California 95126

Phyllis Robinson  
Career Education Consultant  
Wayne County ISD  
33500 Van Born Road  
Wayne, Michigan 48148

Jama Roman, Coordinator  
Career Development Program  
Toledo City Schools  
Manhattan and Elms Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43608

Clinton Rouse  
Coordinator of Career Education  
P.O. Box 1910  
Volusia County Schools  
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015

Brad Snodgrass  
Coordinator of Career Education  
Mat-Su Borough School District  
P.O. Box AB  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Pearl Solomon  
District Curriculum Coordinator  
Pearl River School District  
Pearl River, New York 10965

Don Stanistreet  
Syracuse School System  
Syracuse, New York

Callie Stanley  
Richmond Public Schools  
Richmond, Virginia 23216

James Sullivan  
Coordinator of Career and  
Distributive Education  
Cumberland High School  
2600 Mendon Road  
Cumberland, Rhode Island 02864

Homer Sweeney  
Career Education  
Fremont Unified School District  
40775 Fremont Blvd.  
Fremont, California 94538

Joseph Tomaselli  
Director of Placement and Career  
Education  
Ocean County Vocational-Technical  
School  
Old Freehold & Bay Lea Roads  
Toms River, New Jersey 08753

Sarah Walkenshaw  
Coordinator of Career Education  
4904 Independence Avenue  
Kansas City, Missouri 64424

Carol Wiegner  
Career Education Coordinator  
2424 California Road  
Elkhart, Indiana 46514

Jim Williams  
Career Education Coordinator  
1825 West Beehler Street  
New Albany, Indiana 47150

Gene Willich  
Southwest Kansas Area  
Vocational-Technical School  
Dodge City, Kansas 67801

Gil Woolard  
Director  
Kershaw Vocational Center  
Route 4, Box 143  
Camden, South Carolina 29020

Michael Zockle  
Coordinator  
Career Development Program  
Warren City Schools  
Warren, Ohio 44482

